

## REMARKS

### Rejection of claims 1-11, 14-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 1-11, 14-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Day in view of Tarui. Claims 2-3, 7-8 and 14-15 have been cancelled herein, and therefore need not be addressed. Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite “the plurality of logical partitions comprising at least one logical partition that owns identified I/O and at least one logical partition that does not own the identified I/O”, and to recite “a logical partition suspend/resume mechanism that suspends **all** of the plurality of logical partitions before the I/O reconfiguration mechanism reconfigures the identified I/O by inhibiting dispatch of tasks to **all** of the plurality of logical partitions and waiting until all pending tasks in **all** of the plurality of logical partitions are complete, and that resumes all of the plurality of logical partitions after the I/O reconfiguration mechanism reconfigures the identified I/O by enabling dispatch of tasks to **all** of the plurality of logical partitions. This amendment is supported in applicant’s disclosure at FIG. 6 and related text in the specification. In Tarui, the partition-control program instructs the OS on the current partition to stop using the I/O adapter (step 6000). Page 5, paragraph [0084]. Only partitions that are using the I/O adapter, *i.e.*, that own the I/O adapter, will be instructed to stop using the I/O adapter in Tarui. Claim 1, in contrast, expressly claims suspending all of the plurality of logical partitions, which include one or more logical partitions that own the identified I/O and one or more logical partitions that do not own the identified I/O. Because claim 1 as amended recites suspending all of the logical partitions, including those that do not own the identified I/O, claim 1 as amended is allowable over the combination of day and Tarui.

The rest of the pending claims, namely claims 4-6, 9-11, 16 and 19 have been amended herein to include limitations similar to those added to claim 1 discussed above.

As a result, claims 4-6, 9-11, 16 and 19 are allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

In summary, none of the cited art, either alone or in combination, teaches, supports, or suggests the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By /derekpmartin/  
Derek P. Martin  
Reg. No. 36,595

**MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.**  
P.O. Box 548  
Carthage, MO 64836-0548  
(417) 358-4700